

I hope my colleagues will join me in approving them. I hope it is done this week in a timely manner.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats continue to negotiate with each other on their reckless tax-and-spending spree. Democrats are currently working to lower the bill's top-line number in an effort to meet some of the demands of the few moderate Democrats who have reservations about unchecked government spending.

Now, you might think that lowering the top-line number would involve deciding what programs and spending to eliminate to bring the bill in at a lower cost. Well, not exactly. Yes, Democrats are reportedly eliminating some spending, but the word is that, under pressure from progressives, who are dead set against curtailing their plans for expanding government, Democrats are planning to keep a lot of their most expensive proposals, but simply shorten the funding window to make the costs of these programs seem lower.

Take Democrats' fantastically expensive child allowance. Democrats have every intention of turning their child allowance into a permanent government welfare program, but in order to bring the top-line number of their spending bill down, the word is that Democrats are now planning to officially extend the allowance for just 1 year.

This is, in fact, a budget gimmick on top of a budget gimmick, as Democrats were already attempting to disguise the true cost of the child allowance by officially extending it for just 4 of the 10 years in the bill's 10-year budget window.

They were never, of course, planning to eliminate the child allowance after 4 years, and they are certainly not planning to eliminate it now after 1 year, but by officially extending it for just a year in their tax-and-spending spree, they can manage to make the program look as if it will cost hundreds of billions of dollars less than it will actually cost.

And they are apparently repeating this strategy with a number of their other spending measures.

That paid leave program? Apparently, the White House has proposed a smaller version that would supposedly expire after 3 or 4 years.

Those childcare subsidies? Apparently, those may also now, ostensibly, expire.

The ObamaCare subsidies Democrats want to extend permanently? Well,

once again, it sounds like they are going to try shrinking the apparent cost with a short-term extension.

But, again, let's be very clear here. These short-term extensions and short-term programs are nothing more than a budget gimmick to disguise the true cost of the Democrats' plan. There isn't one program that I have named that Democrats don't fully intend to make permanent.

Don't believe me? Just ask the Congressional Progressive Caucus, which outlined the strategy the Democrats are currently adopting in a letter to Speaker PELOSI.

I quote from that letter:

If given a choice between legislating narrowly or broadly—

the caucus wrote—

—we strongly encourage you to choose the latter, and make robust investments over a shorter window . . . This will help make the case for our party's ability to govern, and establish a track record of success that will pave the way for a long-term extension of benefits.

So the plan is to make these programs permanent and to permanently and massively expand the size of government. Democrats hope to get Americans hooked on the government benefits they are offering while hiding the true costs of those benefits from the American people until it is too late.

Frankly, it is not a bad strategy if your aim is to permanently expand the size of government because the truth is it is pretty hard to eradicate even the most inefficient and ineffective Federal program once it has been put into place.

As Ronald Reagan used to say, the nearest thing to eternal life that we will ever see on this earth is a government program.

That, of course, is what the Democrats are counting on. They believe that, once they put these programs in place, no one from either party will be able to get rid of them.

What is less clear is how Democrats believe these programs are going to be funded in the long term, if, in fact, they have given any thought to that issue at all. I wouldn't be surprised if they haven't.

It is important to note that the short-term programs and program extensions in the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will be paid for by 10 years of taxes. That is right. It will take 10 years of taxes and other revenue-raising measures to pay for programs that are scheduled to last as little as 1 year.

So what happens when Democrats want to extend that child allowance again next year or extend those childcare subsidies for the long term?

Well, that is a really good question, and one for which I would love to hear the Democrats' answer.

Are Democrats going to trot out more tax hikes to pay for extending the child allowance or making the childcare subsidies permanent? Or are they going to just suggest that we add

hundreds of billions—and eventually trillions—to our already dangerously large national debt? And, if they opt for tax hikes, just who is going to be facing those tax hikes?

The Democrats are eventually going to run out of money from millionaires and billionaires, and then they are going to start coming after the wallets of the middle class.

Of course, when I say that the programs in the Democrats' tax-and-spending spree will be paid for with 10 years of taxes, I mean that Democrats are claiming—claiming—that those programs will be paid for, because it is by no means clear that Democrats' tax hikes and revenue-raising measures will actually result in the revenue they are claiming.

Democrats, for example, are claiming that their proposal to increase IRS enforcement measures, including a new requirement that would allow the IRS to look into the details of Americans' spending, will allow them to collect \$700 billion in revenue; but the Congressional Budget Office hasn't confirmed that estimate, and there is substantial reason to doubt that Democrats will be able to collect anywhere even close to that amount even with a doubling of the IRS's budget, a massive expansion of a number of IRS employees, and a number of audits of everyday Americans.

Even if Democrats do manage to rake in every dollar they are claiming, the tax hikes and revenue raisers they are proposing would have long-term costs beyond the dollar amount of the tax hikes.

More than one of the Democrats' tax proposals would have a chilling effect on investment and economic growth, which would mean a less vibrant economy with fewer jobs and opportunities for American workers, and the IRS proposal I mentioned could put the details of Americans' ordinary bank activities into the hands of the IRS, an agency that we have seen repeatedly mishandle the taxpayer data it already has, as recently as earlier this year.

Democrats may be able to come up with a smaller top-line number by hiding the true costs of the government programs they are contemplating, but their "buy now and pay later or pay never" approach to government spending is going to have serious consequences for our economy and for the American people.

Unfortunately, by the time the full costs of Democrats' massive government expansion are felt, it may be too late to do much about it; and that, apparently, is what Democrats are counting on.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WARNOCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 339, Jia M. Cobb, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Lujan, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Cory A. Booker, Raphael G. Warnock, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jia M. Cobb, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rules.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 427 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Padilla
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Rosen
Brown	Kelly	Sanders
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Lujan	Sinema
Collins	Manchin	Smith
Coons	Markey	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tester
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Graham	Murray	Whitehouse
Hassan	Ossoff	Wyden

NAYS—46

Barrasso	Ernst	McConnell
Blackburn	Fischer	Moran
Blunt	Grassley	Paul
Boozman	Hagerty	Portman
Braun	Hawley	Risch
Burr	Hoeben	Romney
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Inhofe	Sasse
Cornyn	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	
Daines	Marshall	

Thune	Toomey	Wicker
Tillis	Tuberville	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Rounds	Warner
-----------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 342, Karen McGlashan Williams, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Lujan, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, John Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Tammy Baldwin, Patrick J. Leahy, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Richard Blumenthal, Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Cory A. Booker, Raphael G. Warnock, Alex Padilla.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Karen McGlashan Williams, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. LUJAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 428 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	Kennedy	Shaheen
Capito	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lujan	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Tillis
Coons	Markey	Toomey
Cornyn	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Murray	Whitehouse
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Grassley	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blunt	Hoeben	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Burr	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Portman	

NOT VOTING—2

Feinstein	Rounds
-----------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Karen McGlashan Williams, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 364, Patricia Tolliver Giles, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia.

Charles E. Schumer, Mazie Hirono, Tammy Duckworth, Martin Heinrich, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Jeff Merkley, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tina Smith, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard J. Durbin, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Patricia Tolliver Giles, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 429 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Booker
Bennet	Blunt	Brown